

<p>Public forum: Parents ask advice from other parents. Many parents strongly recommend this therapy because it really helped their child. Also paediatricians still recommend this therapy.</p> <p>How would you explain this situation (choose one answer)?</p>	<p>Public forum: Parents ask advice from other parents. Many parents strongly recommend this therapy because it really helped their child. Also paediatricians still recommend this therapy. Some inadequate reasoning is involved.</p> <p>Can you explain why: what goes wrong in their reasoning? (and/or In what sense is scientific reasoning doing a better job?)</p>
	<p>i havent analysed the research and think that many practitioners have a good knowledge which should not be cast away to easily</p>
	<p>because they assume that the helmet helped their child, but it is possible that the child recovered naturally without the help of the helmet</p>
<p>they do not want to give up</p> <p>inadequate reasoning</p>	<p>Parents do it because it is better than doing nothing, and they regret it afterward</p>
<p>inadequate reasoning</p> <p>inadequate reasoning</p>	<p>If some condition changes in one specific case (their child), but a study shows that this change doesn't happen more often with the help of a technique (helmet), it doesn't depend on the helmet</p>
<p>inadequate reasoning</p> <p>the set-up of this scientific research (EBM) was inadequate</p>	<p>The reasoning is inadequate because it ignores the fact that activity helping (even unnecessarily) gives a better feeling than hoping for the best.</p> <p>the fact that it helped your child doesn't say if it always will help</p>
<p>parents and doctors are ignorant / stupid (if they do not accept the results of scientific research)</p> <p>the set-up of this scientific research (EBM) was inadequate</p>	<p>Individual cases from pediatricians and other parents are much influenced by personal judgment and preference. So their cases</p> <p>u don't need somebody to explain about something when it's already proven scientific technique</p>
<p>inadequate reasoning</p> <p>inadequate reasoning</p>	<p>no comparison between the case no helmet is worn. They only look at the case the helmet is worn</p>
<p>inadequate reasoning</p> <p>inadequate reasoning</p>	<p>First of all, we are missing information. Second, therefore you cannot say if the parents are well informed on the matter. Finally, pediatricians see change in the therapy, but probably don't look at other cases</p>
<p>inadequate reasoning</p> <p>inadequate reasoning</p>	<p>parents are fragile, and want the best for children. They will use a technique until a research proves and reasons</p>
<p>inadequate reasoning</p>	<p>They are not familiar with the concept that you need a control test, to do a good observation. The way they make decisions is wrong</p>

	There's no enough evidence that the problem was solved by therapy. Maybe it resolves due to some other reasons.
inadequate reasoning	The research found there is no correlation of wearing the helmet helps, does not mean every child who wear the helmet will have no improvement
inadequate reasoning	
inadequate reasoning	
inadequate reasoning	Parents trust the doctor. However, the doctor may get money from the helmet company to subscribe the helmet even though it doesn't help but it doesn't harm either
the set-up of this scientific research (EBM) was inadequate	if someone says they already tried it and it worked, that's enough evidence I need to use it.
inadequate reasoning	Because the deformation naturally repairs itself (same results for helmet and no helmet), the children with helmets show positive results. This does however not mean the helmet helps
inadequate reasoning	If the therapy cannot give results and it is still being recommended, there has to be something that is not explained completely
the set-up of this scientific research (EBM) was inadequate	Because maybe the outcomes that doctors and parents see are not considered sufficient.
the set-up of this scientific research (EBM) was inadequate	
	they rely more on social factors
inadequate reasoning	Probably short term results do make a big difference but on long term, it doesn't make any difference.
inadequate reasoning	The parents and doctors may see other benefits than the researchers.
inadequate reasoning	The professionals reason based on their own cases which do not necessarily provide a firm base.
inadequate reasoning	They relate it to their personal experience, which could have and usually has a bias
inadequate reasoning	They try to extrapolate a sample size that is way too small (only their child). Furthermore, they say it was the helmet that helped them, but they do not take into account other factors that could have been an influence (natural healing, environment etc)
inadequate reasoning	Because as mentioned, with the helmet it works, it does not mean the helmet is the reason it works. It can be external, such as the regular development of a skull.
the set-up of this scientific research (EBM) was inadequate	variables were missed, not every relevant factor was taken into consideration
parents and doctors are ignorant / stupid (if they do not accept the results of scientific research)	I think people feel doing something is better than doing nothing, even if it is not proven that this something does anything (and especially if it does not hurt)
inadequate reasoning	
parents and doctors are ignorant / stupid (if they do	Because it is subjective and had not been measured but guessed

not accept the results of scientific research)	
inadequate reasoning	Because parents feel helpless if they do not take any action. So they decide " might as well" try this.
inadequate reasoning	The conclusion relates a cause and effect together which may not go together.
inadequate reasoning	the natural or a different cure gives the same results
inadequate reasoning	There are emotions involved. And it was workt in there case.
parents and doctors are ignorant / stupid (if they do not accept the results of scientific research)	People assume facts by means of what the majority of society thinks.. Dummies..
inadequate reasoning	Parents and pediatricians cannot conclude from one infant wearing a helmet and having a better skull that the better skull is a direct result from wearing the helmet. Research has shown that this result also occurs naturally which is a cause the parents and pediatricians for some reason did not consider.
	parents are emotionally biased pediatricians are biased towards giving any treatment to help scientific reasoning can be faulty if the experiment was incorrectly set up with too small groups, bias towards participants, etc
inadequate reasoning	because the scientific reasoning is based on carefully performed experiments by experts
inadequate reasoning	one cannot 'know' wheter or not a helmet works better/worse/equal to the natural cause from 1 case. furthermore the success stories are probably easier to find online
inadequate reasoning	Selection bias
inadequate reasoning	The question that is skipped is the question whether there really is a problem.
inadequate reasoning	
inadequate reasoning	Because we only have 1 source to say otherwise. People want to believe that it works and therefore they will until sufficient proof has been shown to the contrary.
inadequate reasoning	The doctors and parents only look at the individual cases, which could be influenced by external factors. There is no reference to compare the results.
the set-up of this scientific research (EBM) was inadequate	They don't think further
parents and doctors are ignorant / stupid (if they do not accept the results of scientific research)	they only look at one or a few case and they do not have the significant numbers. research should have a bigger sample and in science you should see the same result
the set-up of this scientific research (EBM) was inadequate	
inadequate reasoning	scull would probably adjust by itself, but gets assigned to the helmet because parents/doctors had no reference, comparison.
inadequate reasoning	They cannot know that it really helped because they never compare their few results it to children without the treatment

inadequate reasoning	Her presuppositions were wrong at the beginning of the research
inadequate reasoning	Because they only observe one case it is hard to determine the impact of the helmet. Scientific research tries as best as possible to keep the helmet the only variable
parents and doctors are ignorant / stupid (if they do not accept the results of scientific research)	There could be several reasons for a deforming of the skull. If the researcher could not find any differences with the helmet and without the helmet then out of my view the helmet does not make the difference.
inadequate reasoning	there are other benefits, and parents want to have something done with their children, they care for it. not doing anything is unacceptable for them.
parents and doctors are ignorant / stupid (if they do not accept the results of scientific research)	
inadequate reasoning	Based on two experiments the outcomes are different.
inadequate reasoning	
inadequate reasoning	The parents only saw the result with the helmet, while it could have been that the skull would have made the same transformation without the helmet.
inadequate reasoning	Parents/doctors say after wearing a helmet there was significant improvement. However, they do not compare with children without helmets. If the problem would have solved itself anyways, any technique to try to resolve the problem would seem to help.
inadequate reasoning	Parents do not know the result if the child would not wear a helmet.
inadequate reasoning	Because they see babies wearing the helmet and they get a good skull. They don't know what would have happened if their baby wasn't wearing the helmet, so they don't know if it became then right also. So they only see that it became right with the helmet.